

# Entrepreneurs Opinion Towards Government Support For Technology Adoption

Dr. M. Gurupandi

**Abstract** : The globalization of economic activity affects the development of Small and Medium Enterprises. Information Technology opens up new opportunities for external expansion and growth. This study is the nature of descriptive research. The prime objective of this study is to understand the real situation and impact of schemes offered by the government. Hence it is well fit it into the descriptive research design. Both primary and secondary data were used to describe the nature of this study. Primary data were collected using well structured questionnaire and secondary data were collected from magazines, journals, websites and newspapers. In total of 250 samples were collected from the southern districts of Tamilnadu. Area sampling were applied to classify the industrial clusters in each district and Stratified random sample was used to collect the response from the MSMEs in each cluster. Awareness level about the schemes and initiatives of Government must be disseminated properly by the Government Officials by organising training programmes. Enterprises must come front to understand the benefits of adopting technology to improve efficiency in their business. Stakeholders' satisfaction is the dependent variable and which depends on Return on investment, Sales Growth, Growth in market share, Return on Sales. Model summary for regression analysis used to predict the relationship.

**Keywords:** technology acceptance, competitive advantages, complexity

## 1. INTRODUCTION

IN India Small and Medium Enterprises plays a critical role in economic growth. Small and Medium Enterprises provides highest rate of employment growth and account for the major share of its industrial production and exports. They act as an important aspect in development of economy with its effective, efficient, flexibility and innovative entrepreneurship spirits. Now Indian economy has adopted policies of liberalization and globalization. The globalization of economic activity affects the development of Small and Medium Enterprises. Information Technology opens up new opportunities for external expansion and growth. These rapid growing Small and Medium Enterprises are important to world class economy. The globalization poses competitive challenges from abroad. Different Small and Medium Enterprises are affected by different ways. Mostly Small and Medium Enterprises are in risk because of globalization pressure as well as Information Technology will probably not survive in present form without significant changes to improve factors like output quality, cost competitiveness and management practices (OECD, 1997)<sup>8</sup>. The world has observed, for growth and survival Information Technology is necessary to adopt the new technologies in business activities. Due to this changing scenario, adoption of technology is one of exciting areas of research that has been focus intense interest the whole time the world. There is a need to study and analyze the force of transformation from traditional to advanced technology and assessing the performances. Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises) have been accepted as the mechanism of economic growth and for promoting reasonable development. The major advantage of the sector is its employment possible at low investment. The labour concentration of the MSME sector is much higher than that of the large enterprises. The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises constitute over 90% of total enterprises in most of the economies and generate the highest rates of

employment growth as well as account for a major share of industrial production and exports. Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises play a significant role in alleviating poverty and contribute significantly towards the growth of developing economies. Both categories of Manufacturing and Service enterprises have been further classified into micro, small and medium enterprises based on its investment in plant and machinery for manufacturing enterprises or in equipments for services enterprises.

**Table 1.1** Present the ceiling on investment to be classified as micro, small or medium enterprises

Classification	Investment Ceiling for Plant, Machinery or Equipments	
	Manufacturing Enterprises	Enterprises Service Enterprises
Micro	Up to Rs.50 lakh	Up to Rs.20 lakh
Small	Above Rs.50 lakh & up to Rs.10 Crs.	Above Rs.20 lakh & up to Rs.5Crs.
Medium	Above Rs.10 Crs. & up to Rs.30 Crs.	Above Rs.5 Crs. & up to Rs.15Crs.

The Small Industries Department was stamped out of the Industries department with effect from 14.07.93. Consequent to the performing of the Micro Small & Medium Enterprises Development Act 2006 on 02.10.2006, the department was renamed as Micro Small and Medium Enterprises Department in consonance with the Government of India Policy from 22.02.2008.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

After examining the factors which affecting the adoption process of new Information and Communication Technology (ICTs), the Technology Acceptance Model has been the most widely cited in the many of the literature. Building on Theory of Reasoned Action (TRA), originally developed by Dr. Sudha Singh et.al, Technology Acceptance Model aims to examine the attitude and belief of the users that affect acceptance or rejection of the adopting ICTs. Taking this typology into considerations, Enterprise systems can be categorized as Type III innovations because they are embedded in a firm's core business processes. Shang and Seddon claim "enterprises system can be used as their primary engine for integrating

• Dr. M. Gurupandi is working as Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, School of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi – 630 003

data, processes and information technology across internal and external value chain" (2002, p. 272). Tornatzky and Fleischer (1990) has developed the Technology–Organization–Environment framework is used for the adoption of Information Technology innovations. Framework includes the three aspects of a firm's background that influence the process by which Information Technology adopts and implements Information Technology innovations and technological, organizational, and environmental. The Technology–Organization–Environment framework can be used for organizational adoption of Information Technology innovations. These innovations are differentiated into three types: Type I innovations that are confined to the technical tasks; Type II innovations that supports the business administration; and Type III innovations that are embedded in the core of business (Swanson 1994). Earlier studies like Igbaria et al. (1997), used Technology Acceptance Model to examine the impact of relative advantages and complexity on Information Technology adoption and usage. Grandon and Pearson (2004) examined the impact of perceived usefulness (relative advantage) and perceived ease-of use and included in the compatibility as significant factor. Relative advantage, compatibility, and complexity have examined in the previous studies, and have been shown to be significant. As an extension, intends to examine all five technological characteristics. Premkumar (2003) reveals that there are very few studies that have examined the impact of technological characteristics. Rogers' innovation diffusion theory for the organizations will be used as a theoretical basis for the impact of technological factors. Relevant Information Technology experience variables have been examined in many studies (Lee 2004; Lertwongsatien and Wongpinunwatana 2003). Finally, empirical evidence on impact of size has shows mixed results (Damanpour 1996; Fink 1998; Goode and Stevens 2000; Lertwongsatien and Wongpinunwatana 2003; Levenburg et al. 2006). The study conducted by Goode and Stevens (2000) shows that business size, previously the best indicator of technology adoption, was not significantly related to the Web adoption. The main purpose of the study is to investigate factors that encourage, as well as those that remain barriers to technology adoption of MSMEs. An adoption analysis approach considers the process from the organization attributes, resulting in a plan for carrying out the adoption of technology that is rooted in an organizational context and addresses issues of concern to the intended user. This study uses existing literature as evidence to formulate this study and fit it into Empirical Research Design.

### 3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The emergence of new technology is usually characterized by rapid change and development, with high levels of risk as well as the uncertainty surrounding to the technological development, operational usefulness, market opportunities in addition to the strategic value (Bruce, 1988). During periods of fast technological change, introduction of innovatory technological changes, or "technological discontinuities" (Hamilton & Singh, 1992; Robertson & Gatignon, 1986), consequence in the alteration of existing technology or creation of alternative technology.

### 4. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The following are the major objectives of this study

1. To find out the impact of government support to implement the innovativeness in MSMEs
2. To analyse the relationship between perceived relative advantages and government support
3. To understand the relationship between government support and challenges to adopt technology
4. To offer valuable suggestions for managerial implications

### 5. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study is the nature of descriptive research. The prime objective of this study is to understand the real situation and impact of schemes offered by the government. Hence it is well fit it into the descriptive research design. Both primary and secondary data were used to describe the nature of this study. Primary data were collected using well structured questionnaire and secondary data were collected from magazines, journals, websites and newspapers. In total of 250 samples were collected from the southern districts of Tamilnadu. Area sampling were applied to classify the industrial clusters in each district and Stratified random sample was used to collect the response from the MSMEs in each cluster.

Data analysis

#### 5.1 Testing of significant association between Government Support and Innovativeness

##### 5.1.1 Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Variables	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
The owner have original ideas	1.488	4	255	.206
The owner would create something new than improve thing existing	5.113	4	255	.001
The owner often risk doing things differently	2.053	4	255	.088

Prior to conducting any Anova test, it is important to apply Levene's Test for Equality of Variances. The objective of conducting this test of Equality of variance is to identify the homogeneity among the variables. If the Levene test is positive ( $P < 0.05$ ) it is inferred that the variances in the different groups are different (the groups are not homogeneous), than one has to reject  $H_0$  and conclude that the variances are not all equal. Many statisticians the Levene's Test is robust because the true significance level is close to the nominal significance level for a large variety of distributions. The above test is not signifies that  $H_0$  has been rejected for Government Support with "The owner would create something new than improve thing existing" and variance of this group is not equal to each other with "Government Support". The above test signifies that  $H_0$  has been accepted for Government Support with , almost all the following two variables like, "The owner have original ideas" and "The owner often risk doing things differently" and

variance of these groups are equal to each other with "Government Support".

### 5.1.2 ANOVA

Variables		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The owner have original ideas	Between Groups	8.521	4	2.380	5.810	.000
	Within Groups	104.463	255	.410		
	Total	113.885	258			
The owner often risk doing things differently	Between Groups	3.233	4	.808	1.648	.162
	Within Groups	124.863	255	.480		
	Total	128.186	258			

H<sub>a</sub>: "Government Support" of the respondents does vary with the "The owner have original ideas".

The above table shows that the significance of F value for this hypothesis is .000, which is less than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence it is concluded that "Government Support" of the respondents does vary with the "The owner have original ideas".

H<sub>b</sub>: "Government Support" of the respondents does vary with the "The owner often risk doing things differently".

The above table shows that the significance of F value for this hypothesis is .162, which is greater than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence it is concluded that "Government Support" of the respondents does not vary with the "The owner often risk doing things differently".

### 5.2 Correlation matrices for explaining the relationship between Perceived Relative Advantages, Government Support and Growth

Variables		GS1	GS2	GS3	GS4	GS5
Perceived Relative Advantages1	Pearson Correlation	-.024	.033	.080	-.026	.018
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.606	.583	.188	.662	.668
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Perceived Relative Advantages2	Pearson Correlation	.016	-.033	-.013	-.115	-.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.801	.583	.835	.063	.881
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Perceived Relative Advantages3	Pearson Correlation	.082	.063	-.042	.030	-.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.188	.238	.486	.628	.483
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Perceived Relative Advantages4	Pearson Correlation	.053	.034	.003	.063	-.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.388	.582	.861	.311	.823
	N	260	260	260	260	260

### 5.3. Table showing the statements assigned for each Variable

Variables	Statements
Perceived Relative Advantages1	Your company is satisfied with the use of technology in the business
Perceived Relative Advantages2	Technology has helped your company develop new business opportunities
Perceived Relative Advantages3	Technology has helped establish stronger links with stakeholders
Perceived Relative Advantages4	Technology has enhanced the corporate image of your company
Government Support1	Educational support (eg; training, seminars)
Government Support2	Advisory support
Government Support3	Financial support
Government Support4	Human resources support
Government Support5	Technical support

The correlation occurred for Government Support1 (Educational support (eg; training, seminars)) and Government Support2 (Advisory support) is found to be relatively high. (.660). Hence the correlation is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for Government Support2 (Government support towards Advisory support), Government Support1 (Educational support (eg; training, seminars)), Government Support3 (Financial support), Government Support4 (Human resources support), and Government Support5 (Technical support) are found to be relatively high and their correlation values are 0.660, 0.560, 0.682, 0.568. Hence the correlation is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for Government Support3 (Financial support), Government Support1 (Educational support (eg; training, seminars)), Government Support2 (Advisory support), Government Support4 (Human resources support) and Government Support5 (Technical support) are found to be relatively high. And their correlation values are 0.485, 0.562, 0.614, 0.681 respectively. Hence the correlation values are statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for GH2 (Order fulfilment ratio optimisation) and GH3 (Scope for surplus capacity) is found to be relatively high and their correlation value is 0.531. Hence the correlation is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for GH4 (Percentage of growth increased in sales), GH3 (Scope for surplus capacity) and GH2 (Order fulfilment ratio optimisation) are found to be 0.501 and 0.568 respectively. Hence the correlation are statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for Perceived Relative Advantages1 (Your company is satisfied with the use of technology in the business) and Government Support1 (Educational support (eg; training, seminars)) is found to be negative relationship and their correlation value is -0.024. Hence the correlation is statistically insignificant and the null hypothesis is accepted. The correlation occurred for Perceived Relative Advantages2 (Technology has helped your company develop new business opportunities) and Government Support2 (Advisory support) are found to be negative relationship and their correlation value is -0.033. Hence the

correlation is statistically insignificant and the null hypothesis is accepted. The correlation occurred for Government Support3 (Financial support), Perceived Relative Advantages2 (Technology has helped your company develop new business opportunities), Perceived Relative Advantages3 (Technology has helped establish stronger links with stakeholders) are found to be negative relationship and their correlation value are -0.013, -and 0.042 respectively. Hence the correlation is statistically insignificant and the null hypothesis is accepted.

#### 5.4 Correlation matrices for explaining the relationship between Complexity, Government Support and Challenges in Adopting Technology

Variables		GS1	GS2	GS3	GS4	GS5
Complexity1	Pearson Correlation	.161	.161	.166	.156	.160
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.006	.004	.012	.006
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Complexity2	Pearson Correlation	.101	.080	.053	.062	.113
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.103	.150	.388	.250	.068
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Complexity3	Pearson Correlation	.138	.234	.158	.188	.165
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026	.000	.010	.002	.005
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Complexity4	Pearson Correlation	.062	.113	.086	.103	.080
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.244	.068	.160	.088	.188
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Challenges in Adopting Technology 1	Pearson Correlation	.082	.064	.160	.068	.036
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.138	.301	.010	.266	.558
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Challenges in Adopting Technology 2	Pearson Correlation	-.144	-.006	.126	.113	.052
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.020	.818	.041	.060	.406
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Challenges in Adopting Technology 3	Pearson Correlation	.136	.168	.104	.082	.060
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026	.004	.083	.138	.258
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Challenges in Adopting Technology 4	Pearson Correlation	-.018	.032	-.016	-.112	-.053
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.668	.605	.802	.061	.388
	N	260	260	260	260	260
Challenges in Adopting Technology 5	Pearson Correlation	.080	.088	-.026	.045	.084
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.186	.155	.666	.463	.165

Variables		GS1	GS2	GS3	GS4	GS5
	N	260	260	260	260	260

#### 5.5 Table showing the statements assigned for each Variable

Variables	Statements
Complexity1	Your company has encountered problems with locating desired information in relation to technology
Complexity2	There are rapid changes and technological advances in the technology your company adopts
Complexity3	There are technical constraints about adopting technology
Complexity4	There are problems related to the complexity of the application of technology, the skills and training required
Government Support1	Educational support (eg; training, seminars)
Government Support2	Advisory support
Government Support3	Financial support
Government Support4	Human resources support
Government Support5	Technical support
Challenges in Adopting Technology 1	Employees Lack of Knowledge
Challenges in Adopting Technology 2	Financial Support
Challenges in Adopting Technology 3	Statutory Mandates
Challenges in Adopting Technology 4	Space constraints
Challenges in Adopting Technology 5	Pay back of investment

The correlation occurred for Complexity1 (Your company has encountered problems with locating desired information in relation to technology) and Complexity3 (There are technical constraints about adopting technology) is found to be relatively high. (.445). Hence the correlation is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for Complexity2 (There are rapid changes and technological advances in the technology your company adopts) and Complexity3 (There are technical constraints about adopting technology) is found to be relatively high. (.486). Hence the correlation is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for Complexity3 (There are technical constraints about adopting technology) and Complexity4 (There are problems related to the complexity of the application of technology, the skills and training required) is found to be relatively high. (.686). Hence the correlation is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for Government Support1 (Educational support (eg; training, seminars)), Government Support2 (Advisory support), Government Support3 (Financial support), Government Support4 (Human resources support) and Government Support5 (Technical

support) are found to be relatively high and their correlation values are 0.660, 0.485, 0.446 and 0.466. Hence the correlation values are statistically significant and the null hypotheses were rejected. The correlation occurred for Government Support2 (Advisory support), Government Support3 (Financial support), Government Support4 (Human resources support) and Government Support5 (Technical support) are found to be relatively high and their correlation values are 0.562, 0.682 and 0.568. Hence the correlation values are statistically significant and the null hypotheses were rejected. The correlation occurred for Government Support3 (Financial support), Government Support4 (Human resources support) and Government Support5 (Technical support) are found to be relatively high and their correlation values are 0.614 and 0.681. Hence the correlation values are statistically significant and the null hypotheses were rejected. The correlation occurred for Government Support4 (Human resources support) and Government Support5 (Technical support) is found to be relatively high and their correlation value is 0.683. Hence the correlation value is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for Challenges in Adopting Technology 1 (Employees Lack of Knowledge) and Challenges in Adopting Technology 2 (Financial Support) is found to be relatively high. (.485). Hence the correlation is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. The correlation occurred for Challenges in Adopting Technology 1 (Employees Lack of Knowledge) and Complexity3 (There are technical constraints about adopting technology) is found to be negative relationship and their correlation value is -0.111. Hence the correlation is statistically insignificant and the null hypothesis is accepted. The correlation occurred for Government Support1 (Educational support (eg; training, seminars)) and Challenges in Adopting Technology 2 (Financial Support) is found to be negative relationship and their correlation value is -0.144. Hence the correlation is statistically insignificant and the null hypothesis is accepted. The correlation occurred for Government Support4 (Human resources support) and Challenges in Adopting Technology 4 (Space constraints) is found to be negative relationship and their correlation value is -0.112. Hence the correlation is statistically insignificant and the null hypothesis is accepted.

## 6. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- Significance of F value for this hypothesis is .000, which is less than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence it is concluded that "Government Support" of the respondents does vary with the "The owner have original ideas".
- The correlation occurred for Government Support2 (Government support towards Advisory support), Government Support1 (Educational support (eg; training, seminars)), Government Support3 (Financial support), Government Support4 (Human resources support), and Government Support5 (Technical support) are found to be relatively high and their correlation values are 0.660, 0.560, 0.682, 0.568. Hence the correlation is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected.
- Significance of F value for this hypothesis is .162, which is greater than 0.05, so the null hypothesis is

accepted. Hence it is concluded that "Government Support" of the respondents does not vary with the "The owner often risk doing things differently".

## 7. SUGGESTIONS OF THE STUDY

Awareness level about the schemes and initiatives of Government must be disseminated properly by the Government Officials by organising training programmes. Enterprises must come front to understand the benefits of adopting technology to improve efficiency in their business. Stakeholders' satisfaction is the dependent variable and which depends on Return on investment, Sales Growth, Growth in market share, Return on Sales. Model summary for regression analysis used to predict the relationship. It is found that the adjusted  $R^2$  of the Model is 0.540 with the  $R^2= 0.580$  that means linear regression explains 58% of the variance in the data. The following are the variables that MSMEs must concentrate to improve the stakeholders satisfaction like Return on investment, Sales Growth, Growth in market share, Return on Sales.

## 8. CONCLUSION

The globalization of economic activity affects the development of Small and Medium Enterprises. Information Technology opens up new opportunities for external expansion and growth. Awareness level about the schemes and initiatives of Government must be disseminated properly by the Government Officials by organising training programmes. Enterprises must come front to understand the benefits of adopting technology to improve efficiency in their business. Stakeholders' satisfaction is the dependent variable and which depends on Return on investment, Sales Growth, Growth in market share, Return on Sales. Model summary for regression analysis used to predict the relationship. The following are the variables that MSMEs must concentrate to improve the stakeholders satisfaction like Return on investment, Sales Growth, Growth in market share, Return on Sales. If these suggestions will be taken into consideration by the officials of the government, there will be the potential for improving the gap between the schemes offered by the government and understanding level of the schemes by the MSMEs.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Iacovou, C. L., Benbasat, I., and Dexter, A. S. "Electronic Data Interchange and Small Organizations: Adoption and Impact of Technology," *MIS Quarterly* (19:4), 1995, pp. 465-485.
- [2] Mehrstens, J., Cragg, P. B., and Mills, A. M. "A Model of Internet Adoption by Small and Medium Enterprises," *Information and Management* (39:3), 2001, pp. 165-176.
- [3] Lee, J. "Discriminant Analysis of Technology Adoption Behaviour: A Case of Internet Technologies in Small Businesses," *Journal of Computer Information Systems* (44:4), 2004, pp. 57-66.
- [4] Lertwongsatien, C., and Wongpinunwatana, N. "E-Commerce Adoption in Thailand: An Empirical Study of Small and Medium Enterprises (Small and Medium Enterprises)," *Journal of Global*

- Information Technology Management (6:3), 2003, pp. 67-83.
- [5] Damanpour, F. "Organizational Complexity and Innovation: Developing and Testing Multiple Contingency Models," *Management Science* (42:5), 1996, pp. 693.
- [6] Fink, D. Guidelines for the successful adoption of information technology in small and medium enterprises. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* 1998, 18, 243–253.
- [7] Goode, S., and Stevens, K. "An Analysis of the Business Characteristics of Adopters and Non-Adopters of World Wide Web Technology," *Information Technology and Management* (1:1-2), 2000, pp. 129-154.
- [8] Levenburg, N., Magal, S. R., and Kosalge, P. "An Exploratory Investigation of Organizational Factors and E-Business Motivations among SMFOEs in the US," *Electronic Markets* (16:1), 2006, pp. 70-84.
- [9] Dinesh, S. (2018). Technology Adoption among MSMEs in Tirunelveli District. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 119(7), 2703-2716.
- [10] Levenburg, N. M., and Klein, H. A. "Delivering Customer Services Online: Identifying Best Practices of Medium-Sized Enterprises," *Information Systems Journal* (16:2), 2006, pp. 135-155.
- [11] Premkumar and Roberts 1999). Finally, recent studies (Guinea et al. 2005; Thong 2001) indicate that external Information Technology support is a significant factor in the adoption of Information Technology innovations.
- [12] Premkumar, G. "A Meta-Analysis of Research on Information Technology Implementation in Small Business," *Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce* (13:2), 2003, pp. 91-121.
- [13] Igbaria, M., and Tan, M. "The Consequences of Information Technology Acceptance on Subsequent Individual Performance," *Information and Management* (32:3), 1997, pp. 113-121.
- [14] Igbaria, M., Zinatelli, N., Cragg, P., and Cavaye, A. L. M. "Personal Computing Acceptance Factors in Small Firms: A Structural Equation Model," *MIS Quarterly* (21:3), 1997, pp. 279-302.
- [15] Grandon, E. E., and Pearson, J. M. "Electronic Commerce Adoption: An Empirical Study of Small and Medium US Businesses," *Information and Management* (42:1), 2004, pp. 197-216.
- [16] Jeyaraj, A., Rottman, J. W., and Lacity, M. C. "A Review of the Predictors, Linkages, and Biases in Information Technology Innovation Adoption Research," *Journal of Information Technology* (21:1), 2006, pp. 1-23.
- [17] Guinea, A. O., Kelley, H., and Hunter, M. G. "Information Systems Effectiveness in Small Businesses: Extending a Singaporean Model in Canada," *Journal of Global Information Management* (13:3), 2005, pp. 55-79.